

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed November 1, 2005. Through this response, claims 5, 8, 16-19, and 24-25 have been amended, and claims 28-31 have been canceled without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and pending claims 1-27 are respectfully requested.

I. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 1-4, 6-7, 11-15, and 20-23 are allowable over the prior art of record.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 5, 8-10, 16-19, and 24-31 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to over the objection(s) set forth in this Office Action.

II. Claim Objections

The Office Action alleges the following claim objections:

Claims 5, 15, 20-24, and 31 are objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 5, line 2, "comprises" should be "further comprises".

In claim 8, line 1, "the comparing" should be "generating the control signal". See claim 17. Wherein claims 9-10 depend upon claim 8.

In claim 16, line 25, "the current frequency" should be "a current frequency".

In line 1 of claims 17-19, "system" should be "circuit".

In claim 24, line 4, "a control signal" should be "the control signal".

In claims 25 and 28, line 5, “logic” should be “a frequency control circuit” since the performance or operation of the claimed subject matter is performed by the frequency control circuit, not logic as recited in the claims.

In claims 26-27 and 31, line 2, and claims 29-30, line 1, “logic” should be “frequency control circuit”.

With regard to the objection to claim 5, Applicants have replaced “comprises” with “further comprises” as requested. With regard to the objection to claim 8, Applicants have replaced “the comparing” with “generating the control signal” as requested. With regard to the objection to claim 16, Applicants have replaced “the current frequency” with “a current frequency” as requested. With regard to the objection to claims 17-19, Applicants have replaced “system” with “circuit” as requested. With regard to the objection to claim 24, Applicants have replaced “a control signal” with “the control signal” as requested. With regard to the objection to claim 25, Applicants have deleted language that is not performed by the logic, and have amended “the” to “a” as shown to correct for proper antecedent basis. With regard to the objections to claims 26-27, Applicants respectfully submit that all limitations disclosed in these claims are performed by the logic (see, *e.g.*, pages 14-16 of the specification). With regard to the objection to claim 28, Applicants have cancelled claims 28-31 and thus respectfully submit that the rejection to the same is rendered moot.

In view of the above described amendments to the claims, it is respectfully that the objections have been overcome, and thus Applicants respectfully request that the objections be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants' pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,



David Rodack
Registration No. 47,034

THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.
Suite 1750
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500